

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figures 8 and 9. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figures 8 and 9, replace(s) the original sheet 3/4 including Figures 8 and 9.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 3/4

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are now pending in the application. Claims 15-22 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 3-6, 7, 12-13, 23 and 27 are amended herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ELECTIONS/RESTRICTIONS

The Examiner noted the restriction requirement with respect to group I is made Final. The Examiner further noted with respect to groups 2 and 3, if Applicant does not consider the ribs an obvious variant, then the restriction (of Claims 7-8, for the species of Figures 10-11 having “rib-like” projections) remains.

Applicant does not consider the ribs an obvious variant, therefore Claims 7-8 are herein noted as “original” as requested by the Examiner in the outstanding office action, pending Final determination by the Examiner of the Claim restriction status. For completeness in responding to the outstanding office action, and because a Final determination of the status of Claims 7-8 has not been made, Applicant has amended Claim 7 in response to the Examiner’s comment number 12 on page 6 of the office action. Applicant holds notation of Claims 7-8 as “withdrawn” in abeyance pending the Examiner’s Final determination.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. To incorporate the Examiner’s comment number 2 in the “Drawings” comments of page 3 of the office action,

Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet" Figures 8 and 9 have been amended to change the arrowhead location for item 1 so that the arrowhead is separated from the sleeve 2 and therefore correctly identifies insert part 1. Approval of attached Figures 8 and 9 is requested.

Applicant notes the description of each of the figures has been amended in the specification, paragraphs [0024] through [0034], as provided herein to more accurately reflect the type of view and the figure reference basis.

Per the Examiner's comment number 2 in the "Drawings" comments of page 3 of the office action, the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "6", "13", "16" in figure 1 do not correlate to "13" and "16" in figure 2. Applicant notes the description of each of the figures in the specification has been amended to reflect the appropriate section views of Figure 3 from which they are derived. Applicant notes figures 1 and 2 are therefore cross sectional views taken at 90 degree increments from each other. Reference characters "6", "13", "16" in figure 1 therefore correlate to reference characters ["6"], "13" and "16" when rotated 90 degrees in figure 2.

Concerning the Examiner's comments 3, 4 and 5 in the "Drawings" comments of page 4 of the office action, Applicant notes the amended descriptions of the figures provided herewith correct the deficiencies noted by the Examiner.

For comment 3, the sections I-I and II-II for figures 1 and 2 now reference figure 3 for these cut-lines. Figures 4 and 9 now identify the appropriate figures upon which they are based. Figure 5 is now described as being taken from section I-I of figure 7. Figure 6 is now described as the insert part of figure 7, taken from section II-II of figure 7. Figure 8 now described as the insert part of figure 6.

For comment 4, figure 7 is now described as a plan view of the insert part of figure 5. Figure 8 is now described as a cross sectional front elevational view the insert part of Fig. 6. The catches (8) are not visible in the cross sectional view of figure 5 taken from section I-I of figure 7.

For comment 5, figure 10 is now described as a partial cross sectional elevational view of another conformation of the insert part according to the invention. Only the necessary sectional lines are shown in agreement with the partial cross sectional view description.

Based on the proposed amended figures provided herewith and the above discussion, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the drawing objections.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. In particular:

-Applicant has amended paragraphs [0024] through [0034] as presented herein to more accurately describe each of the respective figures; and

-Applicant has also amended paragraph [0047] to change rib-like projections "4" to rib-like projections 43 in line 2.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

The Examiner noted that Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include essential material incorporated by reference to a foreign application. During the telephone conversation between the Examiner and Applicant's representative Thomas Krul on

February 25, 2005, Applicant noted all essential material of the foreign application was included with the originally filed application. No affidavit or declaration is therefore required.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 27 are objected to by the Examiner. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3 and 4 according to the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 4 has been further amended to recite in part "in the installed position, operatively generate a force pressing the circumferential edge of the flange into contact with the wall." Claim 5 has been amended to recite in part "each entry incline operatively compressing its respective catch upon insertion in the opening, and each bearing surface operatively bearing on the wall on a wall side opposite to the flange after a retro-deformation of its respective catch" according to the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 6 has been amended to recite in part "the catches integrated into the wall segment" to define what the catches are integrated into. Claim 7 has been amended to eliminate reference to "rib-like" and replace this term with "rib". Claim 27 has been amended for the spelling of "integrally".

Applicant notes Claim 11 is identified in the office action as being objected to for lacking reference to a direction or plane of the inner and outer wall segments. Claim 11 does not recite the limitations of inner and outer walls. Per discussion with the Examiner and Applicant's representative Thomas Krul on February 25, 2005, Applicant noted Claim 12, rather than Claim 11, recites the limitations of inner and outer walls. Applicant has therefore amended Claim 12 in accordance with the Examiner's comment.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the Claim objections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner noted Claim 13 recites “the bore” without antecedent basis. Claim 13 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for “the bore” by further reciting:

“a bore formable through both the neck and the flange”.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claim 13.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-14 and 23-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews (U.S. Pat. No. 4,363,420) in view of Dalla (French Pat. No. 2573162), in further view of Eberhard (EP0675295) and yet further in view of Miura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,481,682). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is initially noted each of Claims 1, 23 and 28 have been amended to recite in part:

“recesses being in open communication with the bore by first and second slits each extending radially outward from the bore to one of the lateral ends of each of the recesses, any one of the first and second recesses together with its first and second slits together defining a substantially triangular shape”.

None of the references of Andrews, Dalla, Eberhard or Miura individually or in combination, teach or suggest recesses being in open communication with the bore by first and second slits each extending radially outward from the bore to one of the lateral ends of each of the recesses. Further, none of the references of Andrews, Dalla, Eberhard or Miura teach or suggest any one of the first and second recesses together with its first and second slits together defining a substantially triangular shape. The suggested modification of Andrews, Dalla, Eberhard and Miura therefore cannot render amended Claims 1, 23 or 28 obvious. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 23 and 28. Because Claims 2-14 and 26-27 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 24-25 depend from Claim 23, the suggested modification of Andrews, Dalla, Eberhard and Miura cannot render Claims 2-14 or 24-27 obvious for at least the same reasons. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 2-14 and 24-27.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 28, 2005

By: 
Thomas J. Krul, Reg. No. 46,842

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MLF/TJK/mmk